DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 230 CG 014 877

AUTHOR Heppner, P. Paul: Dixon, David N.
TITLE A Review of the Interpersonal Influence Process in Counseling.
PUB DATE Sep 80
NOTE 40p.: Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (88th, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, September 1-5, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents: *Counselor Characteristics: *Counselor Client Relationship: Counselor Evaluation: *Credibility: Helping Relationship: *Influences: *Interpersonal Attraction: Literature Reviews: *Perception: Research Needs: Social Psychology

ABSTRACT

This article reviews research conducted on the interpersonal influence process in counseling, specifically those studies relating to counselor expertise, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. The review is organized and analyzed in terms of variables affecting the client's perception of critical counselor characteristics and effects of the variables on the counselor's ability to influence the client. Evidence is presented to suggest that a wide range of events cue clients' perceptions of counselor expertise, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Results from studies are also presented which found that when sources of counselor expertness are combined, the counselor's ability to influence a client's opinion is increased. Future research problems and methodologies are discussed in terms of theory construction, recent research from social psychology, and internal/external validity. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED197230

A Review of the Interpersonal Influence Process in Counseling

P. Paul Heppner

University of Missouri-Columbia

David N. Dixon

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Paul Heppner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Complete Mailing Address: P. Paul Heppner, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
210 McAlester Hall
University of Missouri-Columbia
Columbia, Missouri 65211

CG 014877

Running Head: Interpersonal Influence

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, September, 1980.

Abstract

Since 1968 considerable research has been conducted on the interpersonal influence process in counseling. This article reviews that research, specifically those studies relating to counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness.. The research is organized and analyzed in terms of (a) variables that affect the client's perception of critical counselor characteristics, and (b) effect of the variables on the counselor's ability to influence the client. Results indicate that a wide range of events cue client's perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. The evidence also indicates that when sources of counselor expertness are combined, the counselor's ability to influence a client's opinion is increased, although parallel findings were not consistently found in the attractiveness and trustworthiness research. Future research problems and methodologies are discussed in terms of theory construction, recent research from social psychology, and internal/external validity.

A Review of the Interpersonal Influence Process in Counseling

A common goal in counseling is to facilitate change in clients. Such a goal implies that the counselor can favorably affect the client to alter specific opinions, attitudes, and behaviors. The process of one person influencing the actions, attitudes, or feelings of another has been labeled the interpersonal influence process, a process which has been considered by some the "central core of social psychology" (Zimbardo & Ebbesen, 1970). Research in social psychology has established the importance of several variables in promoting attitude change: source characteristics (e.g., perceived expertness, trustworthiness), message variables (e.g., message discrepancy, incongruity), and recipient characteristics (e.g., locus of control, authoritarianism).

Strong (1968) initially conceptualized counseling as an interpersonal influence process, as he explicitly integrated social psychological concepts into counseling. Since 1968 considerable research has been conducted on interpersonal influence variables in counseling. Investigators have examined a wide range of variables affecting counselor power, or the counselor's ability to influence a client. The purpose of this paper is to review that research; the overall goal is to organize, summarize, and draw conclusions regarding what is empirically known about the events affecting counselor power. The review will analyze the relevant counseling research in terms of (a) variables that affect the client's perception of critical counselor characteristics (i.e., expertness, attractiveness, trustworthiness), and (b) effect of these variables on counselor power in terms of influencing both client's attitudes and behaviors. The first three sections of this paper will focus on these objectives for each of the three respective counselor characteristics; expertness, attractiveness, trustworthiness. The last section is devoted to future research, both in terms

of examining future research problems as well as identifying methodologies and research paradigms which may contribute to the development of the interpersonal influence research within counseling.

Expertness

Perceived counselor expertness has been defined as "the client's belief that the counselor possesses information and means of interpreting information which allow the client to obtain valid conclusions about and to deal effectively with his problems" (Strong & Dixon, 1971, p. 562). Delineating the construct further, one finds that perceived expertness has been reported to be influenced by events in at least three categories: (a) objective evidence of specialized training such as diplomas, certificates, and titles, (b) behavioral evidence of expertness, such as rational and knowledgeable arguments and confidence in presentation, and (c) reputation as an expert (Strong, 1968). A fourth category seems to be characteristics associated with the counselor, such as sex, attire, and room decor. In turn, researchers have begun to delineate and to examine the relative function of each of the various aspects of expertness within the counseling context. This section will focus on the research related to the four categories of events which (a) influence perceptions of counselor expertness and (b) affect counselor power.

The first source of expertness that will be examined is objective evidence of specialized training, such as diplomas, certificates, and titles. Although writers have pointed out the importance of visual, objective evidence within a counseling setting for some time (Frank, 1963; Raven, 1965; Schofield, 1964), the effect of diplomas, certificates, and titles alone on perceptions of expertness has only recently been investigated in four counseling studies. Gelso and Karl (1974) found that students perceived counselors as less competent if they did not include the word "psychologist" in their titles, and even rated

such counselors as inappropriate for help with personal problems. Two studies (Heppner & Pew, 1977; Siegel & Sell, 1978) found that specific stimuli such as awards and diplomas hung in a counselor's office favorably cued the initial perception of counselor expertness. A fourth study found that presession introductions manipulating titles, educational and vocational levels did not differentially affect student perceptions of counselor expertness (Claiborn & Schmidt, 1977). None of these studies examined the effects of titles or diplomas on counselor power.

Several investigations examined the effects of using titles in conjunction with prestigious information (the third source of perceived expertness) in the initial description or introduction of the counselor. Because these two sources of expertness have been combined as independent variables in many investigations, the review must also examine them jointly. One finding appears quite consistently in studies which combine titles with prestigious information; when the same counselor is introduced with expert credentials as opposed to inexpert credentials, the counselor is viewed as being more expert (Atkinson & Carskadden, 1975; Claiborn & Schmidt, 1977; Greenberg, 1969; Jackson & Pepinsky, 1972; Hartley, 1969; Merluzzi, Banikiotes, & Missbach, 1978; Scheid, 1976; Spiegel, 1976; Strong & Schmidt, 1970a). There is some evidence which suggests that the perceptions of counselor expertness in these studies may be limited to certain counselor characteristics. Scheid (1976) found that the status of the counselor only had a significant effect on two variables, perceptions of counselor competence and counselor comfort; status did not seem to influence perceptions of the counselor in general.

Many of these investigations did not attempt to influence the client's opinions. Eight of the 15 studies (Binderman, Fretz, Scott, & Abrams, 1972; Browning, 1966; Friedenberg & Gillis, 1977; Greenberg, 1969; Jackson &

Pepinsky, 1972; Hartley, 1969; Strong & Dixon, 1971; Strong & Schmidt, 1970a) investigated whether the effects of expert credentials and the counselor's reputation were powerful enough to influence an opinion change in a client. The evidence regarding opinion change is conflicting; Binderman, et al. (1972), Browning (1966), Friedenberg and Gillis (1977), and Hartley (1969) found that credentials and/or a prestigious reputation were sufficient to influence a client's opinions, but Greenberg (1969), Strong and Dixon (1971), and Strong and Schmidt (1970a) did not confirm these findings. Likewise, an earlier study found that status differences did not affect the subject's verbal behavior (e.g., self-disclosure, amount of talking) in an initial interview nor the perceptions of the interviewer's trustworthiness (Jackson & Pepinsky, 1972). In short, it seems that there is considerable evidence which indicates that certain stimuli, such as titles, diplomas, awards, and prestigious introductions do cue a client's perceptions of counselor expertness, but the function of these client's perceptions is not convincingly supported in terms of affecting a counselor's ability to change a client's opinions.

Another category of events which influences perceptions of expertness is characteristics of and/or characteristics associated with the counselor. Research from other areas (e.g., perception, social psychology) indicates that stimuli such as room furnishings affect perceptions of the room occupant (e.g., Maslow & Mintz, 1956; Mintz, 1956) and attire affects perceptions of the person being rated (e.g., Hamid, 1968; Hoult, 1954). Subsequently, the effect of these visual cues on perceived counselor expertness has been investigated. An early study found definite subject preference for moderately formal counselor attire (Raia, 1973). Two studies found that counselor attire (formal or causal) did not affect the subject's ratings of perceived expertness (Amira & Abramowitz, 1979; Stillman & Resnick, 1972). A third study (Kerr & Dell, 1976), found that

attire did interact with interviewer role behaviors in affecting perceptions of expertness, but that the role behaviors seemed to account for most of the variability. Kerr and Dell (1976) found that the interview room (professional or casual) did not affect ratings of counselor expertness. Bloom, Weigel, and Trautt (1977) found that office decor and counselor gender consistently interacted in subject ratings of perceived expertness: an imagined female counselor in a traditional office was perceived as more credible than a female counselor in a humanistic office, and vice versa for male counselors. Amira and Abramowitz (1979) found that room formality affected higher ratings of counselor competence than room informality, but the room furnishings did not affect other ratings (e.g., counselor appropriateness, understanding). An important difference between the last two studies is that the former isolated or maximized the effects of office furnishings in the absence of a counselor, whereas, the latter study examined the effect of office decor in the presence of a counselor.

The sex of the counselor also has received attention. Two studies found no differential perceptions of expertness based on counselor sex (Dell & Schmidt, 1976; Heppner & Pew, 1977). Another study, however, found a significant sex by counselor experience interaction; female expert counselors were rated significantly more expert than male experts, male inexperts, and female inexperts (Merluzzi, et al., 1978).

Race is another counselor characteristic which has been investigated. Earlier investigations within counseling revealed a host of findings indicating counselor race seemed to be a factor in counselor perceptions and effectiveness: black clients reported greater understanding (Heffernon & Bruehl, 1971), greater effectiveness (Banks, Berenson, & Carkhuff, 1967; Gardener, 1972), more self-exploration (Carkhuff & Pierce, 1967, and a higher rate of return (Heffernon & Bruehl, 1971) when they were seen by black counselors. Reviews have concluded

that racial similarity seems to be a significant factor in counseling process and outcomes (Bryson & Bardo, 1975; Sattler, 1970). Counseling research on the interpersonal influence process ,however, has lead to mixed and inconclusive results. One study found that black students did not rate black or white counselors significantly different on expertness variables (Cimbolic, 1972). A second study (Peoples & Dell, 1975) found significantly different expertness ratings were given to black and white counselors by both black and white students,but the differential ratings could not be unequivocally attributed to either counselor race or role performance. Another study (Atkinson, Maruyama, & Matsui, 1978) found that counselor race affected expertness ratings by some, but not by all groups of minority students. A fourth study found an interaction between counselor role and race; counselors in white-referent (attractive) and black-expert roles were more influential in both attitude and behavior change than counselors in white-expert and black-referent roles (Merluzzi, Merluzzi, & Kaul, 1977).

In short, it appears that characteristics of and/or characteristics associated with counselors (i.e., attire, room furnishings, sex, race) do not consistently affect counselor perceptions of expertness. This is a particularly interesting conclusion given the number of studies (12) which have examined this question. One interpretation of this finding is that characteristics such as attire or sex may indeed affect perceptions of counselor expertness, but perhaps only account for a small portion of the variance, especially when compared to the percentage of variance accounted for by other sources of expertness (e.g., expert role behaviors). No conclusions can be made regarding the effects of these characteristics on counselor power, as only two studies investigated this relationship.

A fourth category of events that influence perceptions of counselor expertness is behavioral evidence of expertness. Schmidt and Strong (1970) performed the first counseling analogue research regarding the behaviors associated with expertness. Results indicated that behaviors affecting perceptions of expertness included appearing attentive, interested, confident and organized; using hand gestures; leaning forward; nodding head; and having direct eye contact. Conversely, perceptions of inexpertness were cued by behaviors such as appearing unsure, nervous, confused and inattentive; lacking confidence; using stiff and formal gestures; and being unreactive. A similar investigation by Dell and Schmidt (1976) found that frequency counts of similar behaviors differentiated high and low rated counselors on perceived expertness. The performance of these nonverbal behaviors in other investigations has produced the intended perceptions of counselors as experts or inexperts (e.g., Siegel & Sell, 1978; Strong & Schmidt, 1970a). In addition, the effects of the counselor non-verbal behaviors associated with being relaxed and responsive on perceived expertness have been found in several other studies (Claiborn, 1979; Dell & Schmidt, 1976; LaCrosse, 1975; Peoples & Dell, 1975; Strong, Taylor, Bratton, & Loper, 1971).

Other research has focused on the perceptions of counselors as a function of their verbal behaviors. The amount or level of talking (low, medium, or high) does not seem to affect client perception's of counselor competence (Kleinke & Tully, 1979). In one study low-disclosing counselors were rated significantly more expert than high disclosing counselors (Merluzzi et al., 1978), but in another study disclosing counselors were viewed as being equally competent as nondisclosing counselors (Nilsson, Strassberg, & Bannon, 1979). The use of psychological terms or psychological jargon has been found to increase perceptions of the counselor's knowledge of psychology (Atkinson &

Carskadden, 1975). Counselors using interpretative verbal statements were rated as more expert than counselors using restatements (Claiborn, 1979). A counselor suggesting a specific behavioral treatment approach for a client was rated higher on expertness by undergraduate students than a counselor only employing facilitative, empathic responses (Slaney, 1977). This finding was not replicated, however, when the same study was conducted with actual clients from a Veterans Administration Hospital (Slaney, 1978). Other research found that subjects rated interviewers as more skillful after they had received interpretive feedback on a personality test as opposed to before the feedback (Snyder, Larsen, & Bloom, 1976). Scheid (1976) examined a wide range of client perceptions with regard to two factors, counselor behavior (as defined by the levels of the facilitative core conditions) and counselor status (as indicated in an introduction). He found that counselor behavior produced a main effect on six dependent measures (counselor comfort, counseling climate, client satisfaction, counselor warmth, counselor competence, and general counselor appeal), indicating a strong general effect of counselor behavior. Four studies have found that the counselor's behaviors seem to account for a major portion of the variance in subject's perceptions (Amira & Abramovitz, 1979, Dell & Schmidt, 1976; Scheid, 1976; Siegel & Sell, 1978).

Only one study has examined the influence function of the differential perceptions due solely to the abovementioned expert-like behaviors. Strong and Schmidt (1970a) found that the nonverbal behaviors alone were not sufficient to produce a significant effect on the subject's behaviors.

In short, it appears that a range of both nonverbal (e.g., appearing attentive, confident, organized) and verbal behaviors (e.g., using jargon, interpretive statements) do affect ratings of counselor expertness. The effect of behavioral evidence of expertness on counselor power is largely unresearched.

Several studies examined the effect of combining counselor behaviors with other sources of expertness on counselor power. Four studies examined the effects of combining counselor behavior with titles and prestigious introductions. One study found that a prestigious introduction and the use of abstract, psychological jargon resulted in the perception of the counselor as a more credible source (Atkinson & Carskadden, 1975). Likewise, a role indicating expert counselor behavior in conjunction with professional attire significantly affected perceptions of counselor expertness (Kerr & Dell, 1976). Two other studies (Heppner & Dixon, 1978; Merluzzi et al., 1977) found that when all three sources of expertness (i.e., counselor behavior, titles, prestigious intorudctions) were combined, the interviewer was seen as more expert.

Several studies have investigated the impact of combining two or more sources of expertness on counselor perceptions and counselor power. Strong and Schmidt (1970a) found that when two sources of expertness were used (expert counselor behavior and a prestigious introduction), the counselor was able to significantly influence a client's self-ratings regarding his/her need for achievement. Another study manipulated titles, objective evidence of training and room furnishing. Results indicated that the subjects interviewed by the counselor in the expert condition recalled more occupational material discussed in the interview than subjects interviewed by counselors in the low expert condition (Guttman & Haase, 1972). Dell (1973) found that interviewers in an expert role were able to influence students' self-reports of completing an action plan after an analogue interview. However, the frequency of these reported completions was not statistically different from other experimental manipulations. Childress and Gillis (1977) manipulated all four sources of expertness in a standardized role induction interview. Clients given a role induction containing events associated with all four sources of expertness rated themselves as more improved

after three counseling sessions than clients given a role induction without events associated with expertness. Merluzzi, et al., (1977) assessed the effects of perceived counselor expertness, attractiveness, and counselor race on subjects' attitude and behavior change with regard to procrastination and career planning problems. Results indicated that black-expert and white-referent interviewers were most influential on subjects' attitude changes and on subjects' completion of a questionnaire some time after the interview. Attempts were made to influence a more important client behavior--using a counseling center's vocational library --but no significant differences were found on this dependent variable. Since significant interactions were found between the independent variables, it is difficult to determine the effects of perceived counselor expertness alone on the dependent variables. Heppner and Dixon (1978) manipulated three sources of expertness. The counselors were perceived in the intended manner and were able to significantly influence students to modify their opinions about their level of problem solving skills. In addition, counselors perceived as experts influenced students to engage in a low level self-help activity (i.e., obtaining problem solving handouts) significantly more than counselors perceived as inexperts. The range of influencable behaviors, however, was limited to obtaining handouts, and did not affect another self-help activity, attending a problem solving workshop.

In short, studies which combined counselor behaviors with other sources of expertness consistently cued ratings of counselor expertness and increased the counselor's ability to influence client self-ratings and some behaviors.

There seems to be considerable evidence which indicates that three sources of expertness (i.e., objective evidence of training , counselor behaviors, and prestigious cues) do cue clients' perceptions of counselor expertness. The fourth category (characteristics of the counselor) does not seem to

consistently cue perceptions of counselor expertness. The function of each of these sources alone in terms of influencing a counselor's ability to alter clients' opinions is not well established. Evidence does suggest, however, that when sources of counselor expertness are combined, counselor's perceptions of expertness as well as the counselor's ability to influence clients' opinions is increased. Only four studies examined behaviors that might be influenced due to perceived counselor expertness. It appears that only client behaviors that require a minimum level of effort were modifiable, and that behaviors requiring more effort were not subject to influence.

Attractiveness

Schmidt and Strong (1971) defined perceived attractiveness as the client's positive feelings about the counselor, "liking and admiration for him, desire to gain his approval, and desire to become more similar to him" (p. 348). The utility of perceived counselor attractiveness was initially based on early studies of communication and attitude change which indicated that percieved attractiveness enhanced the ability of a communicator to influence his audience (Back, 1951; Brock, 1965; Sapolsky, 1960). Thus, it was hypothesized that the more attractive the counselor was perceived, the greater the counselor's ability to influence the client. Two questions need to be answered at this point: What type of events influence a client's perceptions of counselor attractiveness?, and What is the function of such client perceptions on counselor power?

Strong (1968) proposed that perceived counselor attractiveness was based heavily on the counselor's behaviors within the interview, specifically behaviors denoting unconditional positive regard and accurate empathy (Rogers, 1957; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967) as well as direct disclosure of experiences, feelings, problems, and attitudes similar to those shared by the client. An analysis of the research on counselor attractiveness revealed investigations which have examined

the effects of (a) attaching verbal labels denoting counselor attractiveness in pre-interview sessions, (b) characteristics of and/or characteristics associated with the counselor, (c) nonverbal counselor behaviors, and (d) verbal counselor behaviors.

The effects of pre-interview counselor descriptions or introductions on perceived counselor attractiveness have been examined in several studies. Greenberg (1969) investigated the effects of informing college students in a pre-interview session that the counselor they were about to hear in an audiotaped interview excerpt was either warm or cold. The students rated themselves as more attracted to the warm therapist and also were more receptive to counselor influence attempts. Patton (1969) obtained similar results in analogue interviews by manipulating pre-interview introductions, liking and being similar to, or not liking and being dissimilar to the client. Goldstein (1971) replicated both of these studies. Essentially he concluded that pre-interview introductions influenced perceived counselor attractiveness when subjects listened to tapes, but seemed to be less effective when subjects subsequently talked to the counselor. A later study (Claiborn & Schmidt, 1977) found that presession information (high versus low status, and expert versus attractive power bases) did not affect subjects' ratings of the counselor's perceived attractiveness after viewing a counseling videotape.

Subsequent research examined the effects of counselor characteristics (e.g., age, sex) on perceived attractiveness. Two characteristics which seem to be interrelated are counselor sex and physical attributes. The physical attributes of a male counselor were found by Cash, Begley, McCown, and Weise (1975) to influence both male and female subjects' evaluations of counselor attractiveness. College students watched a videotape of a counselor describing himself. In half of the experimental sessions the counselor was cosmetically

altered to be physically unattractive. The results indicated that the students rated the physically attractive counselor as more intelligent, friendly, assertive, trustworthy, competent, warm, likeable, and helpful. Two other studies (Carter, 1978; Lewis & Walsh, 1978) offer slightly different findings. Both suggest that the effect of counselor physical attractiveness on perceived attractiveness may be differentially related to the sex of the counselor and the sex of the client. Specifically, both studies found that physical attractiveness exerted more influence for female counselors and clients; physically attractive female counselors were perceived more favorably by female clients. A fourth study (Fretz, Corn, Tuemmler, & Bellet, 1979) found that the sex of the counselor did not affect attractiveness ratings by female subjects.

Another counselor characteristic which has been examined within perceived counselor attractiveness has beer the counselor's age. Results from one study indicate that psychiatric inpatients under 30 years of age rated themselves as significantly more attracted to younger counselors, while other inpatients (ages 30-45, 46 and older) did not differ significantly in their attraction ratings to younger versus older counselors (Lasky & Salomone, 1977). Another study (Kerr & Dell, 1976) found that attractiveness ratings were not affected by characteristics such as interviewer attire (professional or casual) or interview setting (professional or casual).

Several investigations examined the effects of nonverbal behaviors on perceived counselor attractiveness. Strong, Taylor, Bratton, and Loper (1971) initially found that counselors who manifested greater frequencies of nonverbal movements within an interview (e.g., changed body position and posture, smiled, frowned, gestured, changed head and eye orientations, as well as crossed and uncrossed their legs) were rated by subjects as higher in perceived attractiveness. LaCrosse (1975) investigated similar behaviors (e.g., smiles, positive head nods,

gesticulations, eye contact, shoulder orientation, body lean) and concluded that counselors displaying these behaviors at high frequencies were perceived as more attractive. Other research has subsequently found that interviewers in analogue research engaging in these responsive nonverbal behaviors are perceived as more attractive than interviewers engaging in the unresponsive nonverbal behaviors (e.g., Claiborn, 1979; Fretz et al., 1979). One study examined the effects of nonresponsive and responsive nonverbal behaviors on perceived counselor attractiveness in different analogue formats. Fretz, et al. (1979) found that the earlier non participatory analogue results did not generalize to the participatory analogue clients exposed to distinct nonverbal conditions did not differentially rate counselors on perceived attractiveness.

Another class of nonverbal behaviors relates to interpersonal interaction distance. Early research not only found that subjects had preferences for certain spatial features (e.g., seating arrangements) of the counseling environment (e.g., Dinges & Oetting, 1972; Haase, 1970; Haase & Dimattia, 1970) but also that the spatial features affected counseling (e.g., Haase & DiMattia, 1976). One study has examined the effects of seating distance on perceived counselor attractiveness. Boucher (1972) found that schizophrenic (but not alcoholic) clients seated within intimate distances (i.e., 12 inches) rated counselors as less attractive than clients seated at personal (i.e., 39 inches) or social (9 feet) distances.

Another series of studies have investigated the effects of verbal behaviors on perceived counselor attractiveness. One counselor behavior which has received a great deal of attention has been self-disclosure. Within counseling, researchers have identified both positive and negative outcomes of counselor self-disclosure (cf. Dies, 1973; Jourard, 1971; Powell, 1968; Weigel & Warnath, 1968). Within the counseling interpersonal influence

literature, counselor self-disclosures in general have been found to increase perceptions of counselor attractiveness (Merluzzi et al., 1978; Nilsson et al., 1979). In addition, counselor self-disclosures of similar experiences, feelings, and attitudes as that of the subjects have increased ratings of perceived counselor attractiveness (Hoffman-Graff, 1977; Strong & Schmidt, 1971). In examining the sources of both perceived counselor expertness and attractiveness, one study suggests that if a counselor was perceived as an expert, a high degree of self-disclosure would temper an otherwise unattractive role (Merluzzi et al., 1978). Another counselor behavior, talking level, has also been investigated; counselors with low talking levels were rated more positively on perceived attractiveness variables than counselors with medium or high talking levels (Kleinke & Tully, 1979).

Attractive and unattractive counselor roles were developed for analogue research (Schmidt & Strong, 1971) which combined many verbal and nonverbal behaviors (e.g., expressed similarities, body lean, friendly, responsiveness). These role prescriptions have been successful in several investigations (e.g., Dell, 1973; Merluzzi et al., 1977; Sell, 1974; Strong & Dixon, 1971). The relative effects of the nonverbal and verbal behaviors on perceived counselor attractiveness is largely unknown. One study suggests that initial perceptions of counselor attractiveness are more heavily dependent on the nonverbal than verbal behaviors (Caliborn, 1979).

In short, the research suggests that a wide variety of events influence perceptions of counselor attractiveness. Two findings appear most consistently. First, several responsive nonverbal behaviors have been consistently related to perceptions of counselor attractiveness: smiles, gestures, eye contact, body lean, shoulder orientation. Second, several counselor verbal behaviors (e.g., self-disclosures, low talking levels) have also been positively related to

perceptions of counselor attractiveness. Other research leads to more tenative conclusions. Pre-interview introductions seem to influence initial perceptions of counselor attractiveness, although some evidence suggests that the pre-interview perceptions are short lived and may change after the initial session. The physical attractiveness and sex of the counselor seem to differentially affect ratings of perceived counselor attractiveness, based on the sex of the client and counselor. Other counselor characteristics, such as age, attire, and office setting, have not been fully examined and thus no conclusions can be drawn. One preliminary finding is that the effect of age of the counselor on perceived counselor attractiveness may be more important for clients under 30 years of age. Likewise, the research regarding the effects of interpersonal interaction distance on perceived attractiveness is inconclusive.

Another group of analogue studies examined the effects of increasing perceptions of counselor attractiveness on counselor power. Patton (1969) combined pre-interview introductions (anticipated liking or not liking the counselor) with two counselor roles (liking or not liking the client) during a simulated counseling interview. Results indicated that ratings of attraction were affected by both conditions, and that attractive interviewers were more influential in altering the students' opinions of themselves. Schmidt and Strong (1971) varied counselor self-disclosure of similarities and dissimilarities (four per interview) and altered two counseling roles, apparent liking or disliking of the subject through gestures and manners. Results indicated that the counselors were not able to differentially alter students' self-ratings regarding their perceived need for achievement. Similarly, Sell (1974) found that the differential perceptions of counselor attractiveness did not affect ratings regarding their need for achievement. Another study found that while interviewers in an

attractive role were able to influence self-reports of completing an action plan, the frequency of these reported completions were not statistically different from other experimental manipulations (Dell, 1973). Merluzzi et al. (1977) found that black-expert and white-referent interviewers were most influential in affecting attitudinal and some behavior changes, but no significant main effects were found due to perceived attractiveness alone. In a more complex study, Strong and Dixon (1971) crossed attractive and unattractive role behavior with expert and inexpert introductions. While they failed to find influence differences between the attractiveness roles when expert introductions were present, they did find significant influence differences when the expert introductions were removed. It was concluded that expertness may mask some of the effects of perceived counselor attractiveness. Strong (1978) suggested that the masking effect due to expertness may explain the unsuccessful findings of previous research on attractiveness.

In summary, the evidence provided seems to indicate that several events influence the client's perceptions of counselor attractiveness: pre-interview introduction, the type and frequency of nonverbal behaviors, counselor self-disclosure of similarities, and low talking levels by counselors. Other events affecting perceived counselor attractiveness may be counselor and client physical attributes, sex, and age as well as interpersonal distance. The function that these events have on counselor power is less clear. In some cases, behaviors related to counselor attractiveness were able to influence clients to alter their opinions or self-ratings (Greenberg, 1969; Goldstein, 1971; Hoffman-Graff, 1977; Patton, 1969; Strong & Dixon, 1971), whereas unsupportive evidence is found in other investigations (Schmidt & Strong, 1971; Sell, 1974). The interaction effects between perceived attractiveness and expertness may explain some of the above-mentioned inconsistencies as some research suggests that

attractiveness is more functional when the counselor lacks credibility (Strong & Dixon, 1971).

Trustworthiness

The concept of trustworthiness is the third potential source of counselor power. Early research within social psychology investigated the effects of perceived trustworthiness, and quite consistently found that trustworthy communicators were more effective than untrustworthy ones in influencing the attitudes and opinions of other people (Cohen, 1964; Hovland & Weiss, 1951; Kelman & Hovland, 1953; Miller & Basehart, 1969). Based on this research, Strong (1968) initially described trustworthiness as a function of the communicator's (a) reputation for honesty, (b) social role, (c) sincerity and openness, and (d) perceived lack of motivation for personal gain. In addition, specific behaviors were identified which seemed likely to influence perceived counselor trustworthiness, such as "paying close attention to the client's statements and other behavior, by communicating his concern for the client's welfare, by avoiding statements indicating exhibitionism or perverted curiosity, and by assuring confidentiality of all transactions" (Strong, 1968, p. 222).

Strong and Schmidt (1970b) designed a counseling analogue study to evaluate the effects of perceived counselor trustworthiness on counselor influence. The untrustworthy role included behaviors which were intended to reflect ulterior motives on the part of the interviewer, lack of confidentiality of interview content, as well as boastfulness and exhibitionism by the interviewer. The trustworthy role included the absence of the above mentioned behaviors, and in general, a genuine interest in the client. Results indicated that the role manipulation was statistically significant, but that the mean ratings of both conditions were in the trustworthy range.

Kaul and Schmidt (1971) investigated some of the dimensions of perceived trustworthiness by varying trustworthy and untrustworthy verbal content and nonverbal behaviors in twenty-four short videctaped scenes. They were able to construct roles which led to perceptions of trustworthy and untrustworthy counselors, and also found that the interviewer's nonverbal behaviors had a greater impact on perceptions of trustworthiness than did the words that the interviewer used. A similar conclusion was found in another study by Roll, Schmidt, and Kaul (1972); physical manners (e.g., body positions, moderate relaxation, affirmative head nods, hand movements, eye contact) were stronger cues than verbal content for inducing perceptions of trustworthiness. Other research found that counselors were perceived as more trustworthy when their nonverbal behaviors were responsive rather than nonresponsive (Claiborn, 1979). Two studies have examined the effects of specific verbal behaviors on perceived trustworthiness. One investigation found that interpretative statements by counselors were perceived as more trustworthy than restatements (Claiborn, 1979). Another study found that low disclosing counselors were perceived as more trustworthy than high disclosing counselors (Merluzzi et al., 1978). The latter study also found an interaction based on the sex of the counselor; low-disclosing female counselors were rated more trustworthy than high disclosing female counselors, but male high and low disclosing counselors were not different from one another.

Rothmeier and Dixon (in press) studies the effects of perceived counselor trustworthiness on counselor influence using an extended counseling analogue. The untrustworthy role included topic shifts, inaccurate paraphrasing, factual inconsistency, mood and interest change, and a breach in confidentiality. The extended analogue allowed the consistency dimension of trustworthiness to be introduced into the roles. They found statistically significant role differences

in perceived interviewer trustworthiness which held up in a one week follow-up.

Two of these studies examined the effect of perceived trustworthiness on counselor influence. Strong and Schmidt (1970b) found that the experimental manipulation did not differentially influence the client's self-rating regarding need for achievement (note that the manipulation of the independent variable was only marginally successful in this study). Rothmeier and Dixon (in press) found no significant effect of the role manipulation on need for achievement rating immediately following the interview, but a significant effect on the achievement ratings was evident at a one-week follow-up testing.

In summary, several studies have delineated events which positively affect perceptions of counselor trustworthiness: responsive nonverbal behaviors, interpretative statements, behaviors associated with confidentiality, few consistent behaviors, self-disclosures, and in some cases the sex of the counselor. Only two investigations have examined the effects of perceived trustworthiness on counselor power, and only one study has found that perceived trustworthiness increased the counselor's ability to alter the clients opinions. In comparison, less research has been conducted on perceived counselor trustworthiness than perceived attractiveness or expertness. In turn fewer conclusions can be made regarding which events affect perceptions of counselor trustworthiness, and less can be stated about the effect of perceived trustworthiness on counselor power.

Future Research

The purpose of this section is to discuss directions for future investigations, both in terms of delineating research questions as well as identifying research methodologies which may contribute to the development of the interpersonal influence research in counseling. Specifically, topics to be examined include: (a) theory testing and construction, (b) recent research from social

psychology, and (c) internal and external validity.

Strong and Matross (1973) theoretically described counselor power (P) as a function of the congruence between the perception of the counselor as a helpful resource (R) and the perceived needs (N) of the client; symbolically depicted as $P = f(R \approx N)$. It is important to note that the major focus of the interpersonal influence research has centered on the events which influence the manner in which the client perceives the counselor (Strong, 1978). There has been an absence of research which has systematically explored the effects of the client's perceived needs on counselor power. Because of this absence, the theoretical formula $P = f(R \approx N)$ regarding the components of counselor power, has not been examined (save Heppner & Dixon, 1978). Likewise, to date many of the studies reviewed have little implication for theory. Those studies that focus on the perception of the counselor as the only dependent variable and fail to test the influence effects of the manipulated perceptions have few implications for dissonance theory (Strong, 1968), attribution theory (Strong, 1970; Brehm, 1976), reactance theory (Brehm, 1976), or any other theory of interpersonal influence.

Whereas the interpersonal influence process in counseling was originally based on research from social psychology, the subsequent counseling research in this area does not appear to have been integrated with current research from social psychology. The interpersonal influence research in counseling has largely focused on the source characteristics variable (e.g., perceived expertness). Counseling research has focused much less (if at all) on two other major variables established in social psychology on attitude change research: message variables (e.g., message discrepancy, incongruity), and recipient characteristics (e.g., locus of control, authoritarianism). For example, parallel research in counseling regarding message characteristics might be

based on the following social psychological research: messages involving threat of consequences (e.g., Miller & Basehart, 1969), opinionated messages (e.g., Mehrley & McCroskey, 1970), message incongruities (e.g., Dutton, 1973), two-sided messages (e.g., Jones & Brehm, 1970), presentation of factual evidence (e.g., McCroskey, 1969), and effects of forewarning (e.g., Petty & Cacioppo, 1977). Other research could examine recipient or client characteristics, based on the following social psychological research: locus of control (e.g., Ritchie & Phares, 1969), authoritarianism (e.g., Harvey & Hays, 1972), and involvement with an issue (e.g., Dean, Austin, & Watts, 1971). Whereas client characteristics have been examined in counseling for some time, the application of such research to the interpersonal influence process has not been done. Client characteristics such as cognitive complexity (see Harren, Kass, Tinsley, & Moreland, 1979), expectations of counseling (see Ford, 1978), and client involvement in counseling (see Gomes-Schwartz, 1978) have been found to be important variables in counseling outcome research, and also may affect client perceptions of the counselor and the interpersonal influence process. Other lines of research from social psychology which may have relevance for counseling research involve the cognitive processes of recipients or clients through which incoming information and arguments are evaluated (see Hass, 1980), as well as the self-presentation research (impression management) on attitude change (e.g., Hass & Mann, 1976). In short, the above mentioned social psychological investigations identify and examine variables that have been related largely to the process of attitude change, and may have a great deal of relevance for future research on the interpersonal influence process in counseling.

While some investigators have questioned the external validity of laboratory analogue research (Bordin, 1974; Goldman, 1976; 1977), other investigators

have emphasized the advantages of analogue research, such as greater experimental control, flexibility, and practicality (Munley, 1974). The concern over the external validity of analogue research is nonetheless an important issue. To increase the generalizability or direct applicability of analogue research to counseling practice, Strong (1971) proposed five criteria or "boundary conditions" for laboratory research. These boundary conditions consist of the following considerations: (a) counseling is a conversation between or among persons, (b) status differences between or among interactants constrain the conversation, (c) the duration of contact between interactants in counseling varies, and at times is extended, (d) many clients are motivated to change, and (e) many clients are psychologically distressed and are heavily invested in the behaviors they seek to change. Although other criteria could be used, these five conditions were deemed appropriate to initially assess the external validity of the investigations reviewed in the paper under the rubric of the interpersonal influence process in counseling. The third condition (extended duration) was operationally defined as two sessions.

Of the 51 reviewed studies which examined events associated with perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness, 29 did not meet any of the boundary conditions, 16 met only the first two conditions (Boucher, 1972; Cimbolic, 1972; Fretz et al., 1979; Graff, 1975; Heppner & Pew, 1977; Jackson & Pepinsky, 1972; Kerr & Dell, 1976; Merluzzi et al., 1977; Patton, 1969; Schmidt & Strong, 1971; Sell, 1974; Snyder et al., 1976; Stillman & Resnick, 1972; Strong & Dixon, 1971; Strong & Schmidt, 1970a, 1970b), five studies fulfilled three conditions (Binderman et al., 1972; Browning, 1966; Dell, 1973; Heppner & Dixon, 1978; Rothmeier & Dixon, in press), and one study met four conditions (Hartley, 1969).

Over half of the studies reviewed met none of the five boundary conditions. The specific consequences of meeting one or more of the boundary conditions on the external validity of the analogue studies to counseling practice is unclear. To this end Munley (1974) suggested that research was needed to investigate differences between data collected in laboratory analogues (meeting a varying number of boundary conditions) and counseling settings. The results of such investigations have been mixed. Two studies found significantly different responses between subjects participating in a quasi-counseling analogue and subjects in a vicarious-participation analogue (Fretz et al., 1979; Helms, 1976). Other sutdies have found very similar results between analogue studies and naturalistic investigations (Elliot, 1979; Helms, 1978). A more complex investigation revealed that the generalizability of analogues may be contingent on the dependent variables in question, the type of relationship to be predicted, and the experience level of the counselors (Kushner, 1978). In short, the external validity of the analogue research on the interpersonal influence process in counseling is unclear, and warrants further investigation especially with regard to a range of dependent variables.

This assessment of the external validity of interpersonal influence research does not negate the counclusions formulated earlier regarding the research findings for perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. It is the authors' opinion that the earlier research has successfully identified and isolated events associated with perceived expertness, attractiveness, and to some extent trustworthiness in counseling, which is an outcome that was achieved through highly controlled (analogue) conditions. Given the multitude of studies in this area which have emphasized internal validity, it now seems desirable to evaluate the external validity of these findings through alternative research strategies, such as through what has been labeled experimental

field and correlational field research (Gelso, 1979). Further analogue research may also have application for counseling, but should attempt to meet more of Strong's proposed "boundary conditions" than typical of previous research.

In addition to strengthening the external validity of the earlier research, field research in this area holds a great deal of potential for creating new knowledge. For example, at present there is little data on the relative or comparative effects of the various sources of expertness (or attractiveness and trustworthiness for that matter) on client perceptions of counselors, and ultimately the interpersonal process. Furthermore, research has not examined what happens to the events which cue perceptions of expertness and affect the influence process over time (i.e., after the first, second, third or nth interview). Research questions abound: Do some behaviors affect perceptions of counselor expertness and subsequently the influence process, more than others? Are some events more salient for perceived counselor expertness initially, such as diplomas and titles? Does the relative importance of events change over time, such as counselor attire, verbal behaviors (e.g., counselor self-disclosure) and nonverbal behaviors (e.g., attentiveness)? What are the relationships between perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness initially, and over time? In short, since Strong's 1968 position paper sufficient evidence has been gathered to support the existence of the interpersonal influence process in counseling. It appears that the general question about the existence of the process has been answered. It it now time to ask more specific questions of "who, what, when, where?" (Gelso, 1979) in examining the events associated with the interpersonal influence process in greater detail.

Footnotes

Requests for reprints should be sent to P. Paul Heppner, 210 McAlester Hall, Department of Psychology, University of Missouri- Columbia, Columbia, Missouri, 65211.

References

Amira, S., & Abramowitz, S. I. Therapeutic attraction as a function of therapist attire and office furnishings. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1979, 47, 198-200.

Atkinson, D. R., & Carskaddon, G. A prestigious introduction, psychological jargon, and perceived counselor credibility. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 180-186.

Atkinson, D. R., Maruyama, M., & Matsui, S. Effects of counselor race and counseling approach on Asian American's perceptions of counselor credibility and utility. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 76-83.

Back, K. W. Influence through social communication. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1951, 46, 9-23.

Banks, G., Berenson, B., & Carkhuff, R. The effects of counselor race and training upon counseling process with Negro clients in initial interviews. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1967, 23, 70-72.

Binderman, R. M., Fretz, B. R., Scott, N. A., & Abrams, M. H. Effects of interpreter credibility and discrepancy level of results on responses to test results. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 399-403.

Bloom, L. J., Weigel, R. G., & Trautt, G. M. "Therapeugenic" factors in psychotherapy: Effects of office decor and subject-therapist sex pairings on the perception of credibility. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 867-873.

Bordin, E. S. Research strategies in psychotherapy. New York: Wiley, 1974.

Boucher, M. L. Effect of seating distance on interpersonal attraction in an interview situation. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1972, 38, 15-19.

Brehm, S. S. The application of social psychology to clinical practice. New York: Wiley, 1976.

Brock, T. C. Communicator-recipient similarity and decision change. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 650-657.

Browning, G. J. An analysis of the effects of therapist prestige and levels of interpretation on client response in the initial phase of psychotherapy (Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1965), Dissertation Abstracts, 1966, 26, 4803.

Bryson, S., & Bardo, H. Race and the counseling process: An overview. Journal of Non-White Concerns in Personnel and Guidance, 1975, 4, 5-15.

Carkhuff, R. R., & Pierce, R. Differential effects of therapist race and social class upon patient depth of self-exploration in the initial clinical interview. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 632-634.

Carter, J. A. Impressions of counselors as a function of counselor physical attractiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 28-34.

Cartwright, D. Structural balance: A generalization of Heider's theory. Psychological Review, 1956, 63, 277-293.

Cash, T. F., Begley, P. J., McCown, D. A., & Weise, B. C. When counselors are heard but not seen: Initial impact of physical attractiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 273-279.

Childress, R., & Gillis, J. S. A study of pretherapy role induction as an influence process. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1977, 33, 540-544.

Cimbolic, P. T. Counselor race and experience effects on black clients. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1972, 39, 328-332.

Claiborn, C. D. Counselor verbal interaction; nonverbal behavior, and social power. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1979, 26, 378-383.

Claiborn, C. D., & Schmidt, L. D. Effects of preseassion information on the perception of the counselor in an interview. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 259-263.

Cohen, A. Communication discrepancy and attitude change: A dissonance theory approach. Journal of Personality, 1959, 27, 286, 396.

Dean, R., Austin, J., & Watts, W. Forewarning effects in persuasion: Field and classroom experiments. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 18, 210-221.

Dell, D. M. Counselor power base, influence attempt, and behavior change in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 399-405.

Dell, D. M., & Schmidt, L. D. Behavioral cues to counselor expertness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 197-201.

Dies, R. R. Group therapist self-disclosure: An evaluation by clients. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 344-348.

Dinges, N., & Oetting, E. R. Interaction distance anxiety in the counseling dyad. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 146-149.

Dutton, D. The maverick effect: Increased communicator credibility as a result of abandoning a career. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 1973, 5, 145-151.

Elliott, R. How clients perceive helper behaviors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1979, 26, 285-294.

Festinger, L. A. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1957.

Ford, J. D. Therapeutic relationship in behavior therapy: An empirical analysis. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 1302-1314.

Frank, J. D. Persuasion and healing. New York: Schocken Books, 1963.

Fretz, B. R., Corn, R., Tuemmler, J. M., Bellet, W. Counselor nonverbal behaviors and client evaluations. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1979, 26, 304-311.

Friedenberg, W. P., & Gillis, J. S. An experimental study of the effectiveness of attitude change techniques for enhancing self-esteem. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1977, 33, 1120-1124.

Gardener, W. E. The differential effects of race, education, and experience in helping. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1972, 28, 87-89.

Gelso, C. J. Research in counseling: Methodological and professional issues. The Counseling Psychologist, 1979, 8, 7-35.

Gelso, C. J., & Karl, N. J. Perceptions of "counselors" and other help-givers: What's in a label? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 21, 243-247.

Goldman, L. Toward more meaningful research. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1977, 55, 363-368.

Goldman, L. A. A revolution in counseling research. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 543-552.

Goldstein, A. P. Psychotherapy research by extrapolation from social psychology. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 38-45.

Goldstein, A. P. Psychotherapeutic attraction. New York: Pergamon Press, 1971.

Goldstein, A. P., Heller, K., & Sechrest, L. B. Psychotherapy and the psychology of behavior change. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Gomes-Schwartz, B. Effective ingredients in psychotherapy: Prediction of outcome from process variables. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 1023-1035.

Greenberg, R. P. Effects of presession information on perception of the therapist and receptivity to influence in a psychotherapy analogue. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 425-429.

Guttman, M. A. J., & Haase, R. F. Effect of experimentally induced sets of high and low 'expertness' during brief vocational counseling. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1972, 3, 171-177.

Haase, R. F. Relationship of sex and instructional set to the regulation of interpersonal interaction distance in a counseling analogue. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 233-236.

Haase, R. F., & DiMattia, D. J. Proxemic behavior: Counselor, Administrator, and client preference for seating arrangement in dyadis interaction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 319-325.

Haase, R. F., & DiMattia, D. J. Spatial environments and verbal conditioning in a quasi-counseling interview. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 414-421.

Harren, V. A., Kass, R. A., Tinsley, H. E. A., & Moreland, J. R. Influence of gender, sex-role attitudes, and cognitive complexity on gender-dominant career choices. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1979, 26, 227-234.

Hartley, D. L. Perceived counselor credibility as a function of the effects of counseling interaction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 63-68.

Harvey, J., & Hays, D. Effect of dogmatism and authority of the source of communication upon persuasion. Psychological Reports, 1972, 30, 119-122.

Hass, R. G. Effects of source characteristics on the cognitive processing of persuasive messages and attitude change. In R. E. Petty, T. M. Ostrom, & T. C. Brock (Eds.), Cognitive Responses in Persuasion. Hillsdale, N. J.: Erlbaum Associates, 1980.

Hass, R. G., & Mann, R. W. Anticipatory belief change: Persuasion or impression management. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 105-111.

Hamid, P. Style of dress as a perceptual cue in impression formation. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1968, 26, 904-906.

Heffernon, A. & Bruehl, D. Some effects of race of inexperienced lay counselors on black junior high school students. Journal of School Psychology, 1971, 9, 35-37.

Helms, J. E. A comparison of two types of counseling analogues. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 422-427.

Helms, J. E. Counselor reactions to female clients: Generalizing from analogue research to a counseling setting. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 193-199.

Heppner, P. P., & Dixon, D. N. The effects of client perceived need and counselor role on clients' behaviors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 514-519.

Heppner, P. P., & Pew, S. Effects of diplomas, awards, and counselor sex on perceived expertness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 147-149.

Hoffman-Graff, M. A. Interviewer use of positive and negative self-disclosure and interviewer-subject sex pairing. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 184-190.

Hoult, T. F. Experimental measurement of clothing as a factor in some social ratings of selected American men. American Sociology Review, 1954, 19, 324-328.

Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. R. Communication and persuasion: Psychological studies of opinion change. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

Jackson, R. H., & Pepinsky, H. B. Interviewer activity and status effects upon revealingness in the initial interview. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1972, 28, 400-404.

Jones, R. & Brehm, J. Persuasiveness of one- and two sided communications as a function of awareness there are two sides. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1970, 6, 47-56.

Jourard, S. M. Self-disclosure: An experimental analysis of the transparent self. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Kaul, T. J., & Schmidt, L. D. Dimensions of interviewer trustworthiness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 542-548.

Kelly, G. A. The psychology of personal constructs (Vol. I). New York: W. W. Norton, 1955.

Kerr, B. A., & Dell, D. M. Perceived interviewer expertness and attractiveness: Effects of interviewer behavior and attire and interview setting. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 553-556.

Kleinke, C. L., & Tully, T. B. Influence of talking level on perceptions of counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1979, 26, 23-29.

Kushner, K. On the external validity of two psychotherapy analogues. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 1394-1402.

LaCrosse, M. B. Nonverbal behavior and perceived counselor attractiveness and persuasiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 563-566.

Lasky, R. G., & Salomone, P. R. Attraction to psychotherapy: Influences of therapist status and therapist-patient age similarity. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1977, 33, 511-516.

Maslow, A. H., & Mintz, N. L. Effects of esthetic surroundings: I. Initial effects of three esthetic conditions upon perceiving "energy" and "well-being" in faces. Journal of Psychology, 1956, 41, 247-254.

McCroskey, J. A summary of experimental research on the effects of evidence, in persuasive communication. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1969, 55, 169-176.

Mehrley, R., & McCroskey, J. Opinionated statements and attitude intensity as predictors of attitude change and source credibility. Speech Monographs, 1970, 37, 47-52.

Merluzzi, T. V., Banikiotes, P. G., & Missbach, J. W. Perceptions of counselor sex, experience, and disclosure level. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 479-482.

Merluzzi, T. V., Merluzzi, B. H., & Kaul, T. J. Counselor race and power base: Effects on attitudes and behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 430-436.

Miller, G. R., & Baseheart, J. Source trustworthiness, opinionated statements and response to persuasive communication. Speech Monographs, 1969, 36, 1-7.

Mintz, N. L. Effects of esthetic surroundings: II. Prolonged and repeated experience in a "beautiful" and an "ugly" room. Journal of Psychology, 1956, 41, 459-466.

Munley, P. H. A review of counseling analogue research methods. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 320-330.

Nilsson, D. E. Strassberg, D. S., & Bannon, J. Perceptions of counselor self-disclosure: An analogue study. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1979, 26, 399-404.

Patton, M. J. Attraction, discrepancy, and responses to psychological treatment. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 317-324.

Peoples, V. Y., & Dell, D. M. Black and white student preferences for counselor roles. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 529-534.

Petty, R. E. & Cacioppo, J. T. Forewarning, cognitive responding, and resistance to persuasion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1977, 35, 645-655.

Powell, W. J. Differential effectiveness of interviewer interventions in an experiment interview. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 210-215.

Raia, J. R. Encoded and decoded semantic differential meaning of counselor attire, seating, and proxemic variables (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 3959B. (University Microfilms Nc. 73-2100).

Raven, B. H. Social influence and power. In Ivan D. Steiner & Martin Fishbein (Eds.). Current studies in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1965.

Ritchie, E., & Phanes, E. Attitude change as a function of internal-external control and communication status. Journal of Personality, 1969, 37, 429-443.

Rogers, C. R. The necessary and sufficient conditions of the therapeutic personality change. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 95-103.

Roll, W. V., Schmidt, L. D., & Kaul, T. J. Perceived interviewer trustworthiness among black and white convicts. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 537-541.

Rothmeier, R. C. & Dixon, D. N. Trustworthiness and influence in an extended counseling analogue interview. Journal of Counseling Psychology, in press.

Sapolsky, A. Effect of interpersonal relationships upon verbal conditioning. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 60, 241-246.

Sattler, J. Racial "experimental effects" in experimentation, testing, interviewing and psychotherapy. Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 73, 137-160.

Scheid, A. B. Client's perception of the counselor: The influence of counselor introduction and behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 503-508.

Schmidt, L. D., & Strong, S. R. "Expert" and "inexpert" counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 115-118.

Schmidt, L. D., & Strong, S. R. Attractiveness and influence in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 348-351.

Schofield, W. Psychotherapy, the purchase of friendship. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Sell, J. M. Effects of subject self-esteem, test performance feedback, and counselor attractiveness on influence in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 342-344.

Slaney, R. B. Perceptions of alternative roles for facilitative conditions. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 169-172.

Slaney, R. B. Therapist and client perceptions of alternative roles for the facilitative conditions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 1146-1147.

Snyder, C. D., Carson, D. L., & Bloom, L. J. Acceptance of general personality interpretations prior to and after receipt of diagnostic feedback supposedly based on psychological, graphological, and astrological assessment procedures. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1976, 32, 258-265.

Spiegel, S. B. Expertness, similarity, and perceived counselor competence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 436-441.

Stillman, S., & Resnick, H. Does counselor attire matter? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 347-348.

Strong, S. R. Counseling: An interpersonal influence process. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 215-224.

Strong, S. R. Experimental laboratory research in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 106-110.

Strong, S. R. Social psychological approach to psychotherapy research. In S. Garfield & A. Bergin (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley, 1978.

Strong, S. R., & Dixon, D. N. Expertness, attractiveness, and influence in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 562-670.

Strong, S. R., & Matross, R. P. Change processes in counseling and psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 28-37.

Strong, S. R., & Schmidt, L. D. Expertness and influence in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 81-87. (a)

Strong, S. R., & Schmidt, L. D. Trustworthiness and influence in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 197-204. (b)

Strong, S. R., Taylor, R. G., Bratton, J. C., & Loper, R. G. Nonverbal behavior and perceived counselor characteristics. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 554-561.

Truax, C. B., & Carkhuff, R. R. Toward effective counseling and psychotherapy: Training and practice. Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.

Weigel, R. G., & Warnath, C. F. The effects of group therapy on reported self-disclosure. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1968, 18, 31-41.

Zimbardo, P., & Ebbesen, E. B. Influencing attitudes and changing behavior. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1970.